

REMARKS

The Office Action of March 28, 2008 was received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below.

Claims 1, 4-8, 10-12 and 15-20 were pending prior to the instant amendment. By this amendment, claims 1, 4-8 and 10-12 are amended for clarity and to correct minor typographical errors. Consequently, claims 1, 4-8, 10-12 and 15-20 are currently pending in the instant application with claims 1, 4 and 5 being independent.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4-8, 9-12 and 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,189,654 to Yamazaki et al. (Yamazaki '654) and claims 4, 7, 11, 16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0224433 to Yamazaki et al. (Yamazaki '433). These rejections are traversed for the reasons advanced in detail below.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Yamazaki '654 teaches "a method of manufacturing display device comprising: forming a conductive film over a substrate by ejecting liquid droplets containing conductive particles by using a first liquid droplet ejecting apparatus comprising a liquid droplet ejecting head provided with a plurality of liquid droplet ejecting nozzles arranged linearly (see, column 2, lines 19-50); forming a resist pattern locally on the conductive film by using a second liquid droplet ejecting apparatus comprising a liquid droplet ejecting head provided with a plurality of ejecting nozzles arranged linearly (see, for example, figure 9B)."

In response, Applicant contends that the rejection is improper. Initially, Yamazaki '654 teaches *a manufacturing method for wiring that forms a conductive layer on a substrate having an insulating surface by a CVD method, an evaporation method, or a sputtering*

method, forms a resist pattern, which is in contact with the conductive layer, using a head for jetting a composition containing a photosensitive agent in col. 2, lines 35-45. However, it does not appear that Yamazaki '654 teaches the features of a (first) liquid droplet ejecting apparatus comprising a liquid droplet ejecting head provided with a plurality of liquid droplet ejecting nozzles arranged linearly, as recited in independent claims 1, 4 and 5.

Further, Fig. 9B of Yamazaki '654 shows an example of a mask which is used when a conductive film is formed by the sputtering method (see col. 20, lines 13-32). Therefore, Yamazaki '654 does not appear to teach the feature of a (second) liquid droplet ejecting apparatus comprising a liquid droplet ejecting head provided with a plurality of ejecting nozzles arranged linearly, as recited in independent claim 1.

Thus, Yamazaki '654 fails to disclose all of the features of the independent claims 1, 4 and 5, as presently claimed. Therefore, it cannot be said that Yamazaki '654 anticipates the present invention, as claimed.

As stated above, claims 4, 7, 11, 16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamazaki '433. On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that "although figure 11B (it may be figure 11D) of Yamazaki depicts a plurality of electrode pairs, it also shows that the contact hole is formed by etching with plasma that is produced from only a single pair of electrodes."

In response, Applicant contends that the rejection is improper. It appears that Yamazaki '433 may show that the contact hole is formed by etching with plasma, however, in detail the contact hole is formed by a plasma state having a plurality of nozzles and using one of the plurality of nozzles of the plasma state. Therefore, Applicant contends that Yamazaki '433 fails to teach the features of forming a contact hole by etching the insulating film at the atmospheric pressure or a pressure close to the atmospheric pressure by using a

second plasma generating device provided with only a pair of electrodes, as claimed. Thus, Yamazaki '433 fails to disclose all of the features of independent claim 4, as presently claimed. Therefore, it cannot be said that Yamazaki '433 anticipates the present invention, as claimed.

For anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present (M.P.E.P. 706.02). Since each and every element, as set forth in the claims are not found either expressly or inherently described as required by the M.P.E.P., neither Yamazaki '654 nor Yamazaki '433 can be said to anticipate the invention, as presently claimed. Hence, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 10, 15 and 18 depend from independent claim 1 and is patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 7, 11, 16 and 19 depend from independent claim 4 and is patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 4.

Claims 8, 12, 17 and 20 depend from independent claim 5 and is patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 5.

In addition, each of the dependent claims also recite combinations that are separately patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, this claimed invention is not anticipated or rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the entry of this response, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In discussing the specification, claims, and drawings in this response, it is to be understood that Applicant in no way intends to limit the scope of the claims to any exemplary

embodiments described in the specification and/or shown in the drawings. Rather, Applicant is entitled to have the claims interpreted broadly, to the maximum extent permitted by statute, regulation, and applicable case law.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite issuance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned agent at (202) 585-8100.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean A. Pryor, Reg. #48103/

Sean A. Pryor

NIXON PEABODY LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202-585-8000
Fax: 202-585-8080